CLAUSES 65 TO 72.

Mr. SPEAKER.— will put the rest of the clauses together. The question is :

"That clauses 65 to 72, both inclusive, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 65 to 72, both inclusive, were added to the Bill.

CLAUSE 1, THE TITLE AND THE PREAMBLE

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That the Title and the Preamble, and clause 1, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1, the Title and the Pre-amble were added to the Bill.

MOTION TO PASS

Sri VEERENDRA PATIL (Minister for Public Works).—Sir, I beg to move :

"That the Mysore Irrigation Bill, 1965, as reported by the Joint Select Committee, be passed."

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That the Mysore Irrigation Bill, 1965, as reported by the Joint Select Committee, be passed."

The motion was adopted.

DEMANDS FOR ADDITIONAL AND SUPPLEMENTARY GRANTS FOR THE YEAR 1964-65 (2nd INSTALMENT).

(Members' Representation)

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—Sir, we are told that the discussion on the Supplementary Demands for Grants has been allowed to be initiated in the Upper House, day before yesterday.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—Who said that ? Has the member verified ?

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—I have verified it and it is a fact.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Without verifying.....I have got a similar request. Is the member sure that the Bill was introduced earlier ?

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—It has been allowed to be discussed also.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Which article prohibits it ?

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—Article 198.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Does it mean that it should be discussed and passed in the Lower House and then it has to be debated in the Upper House. We cannot stand on technical ground. This House may vote it. They do not have a right to pass it. They have to discuss after it is passed here.

Sri B. D. JATTI (Minister for Finance).—Appropriation Bill is not passed.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—Suppose, it is introduced in this House. Could it be taken as passed ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—What is it ? Should the demands be passed by the Legislative Council ?

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—The Appropriation Bill will be voted, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Are we dealing with the Appropriation Bill now ?

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO (Mysore City).—Sir, the procedure laid down in article 198 (2) of the Constitution is that after the Money Bill has been passed by the Legislative Assembly of a State having a Legislative Council, it shall be transmitted to the Legislative Council with its recommendation.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Does the member call Supplementary Demands as a Money Bill ?

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—The provisions under article 207 refer to financial matters. Therefore, where it is Supplementary or Original Grants, the procedure is the same.

Mr. SPEAKER.—How are the grants discussed ?

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—It is passed here and sent for discussion there.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The transmission can only be after the Money Bill passed by this House. The Money Bill in this House, according to the version of the member is it Demands or Appropriation Bill ?

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—Demands themselves, which need an Appropriation Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—How many years have we functioned ? Have we done it at any time all these years ?

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—Suppelementary Demands are covered under article 205. It prescribes a procedure that has to be followed and the procedure laid down is under articles 202, 203 and 204. These are the articles that deal with the original grant. If this is the procedure to be applied to original grants, it should equally apply to the present case. If that should apply, article 198 is clear.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If it is in the case of the original Budget, we must pass the Budget and then they have to discuss ? Is it not so ? It leads to that position. According to the member, we must pass the Appropriation Bill and then send it there. They should have no chance in voting. Are these things coming for the first time in this Assembly ?

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—Sir, the point is this. I quite see the point of the Hon'ble Speaker. It is not coming here for the first time as a Budget Memorandum. It is coming as a Supplementary Demand for a second time in this House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble member raised a point saying that it is specifically provided that in the case of the Budget this is the procedure and this should apply *mutatis mutandis* to supplementary demends also. If in the case of the original demand or Budget we discuss and then the Legislative Council discusses we pass it and they don't vote it, it leads to this. Accepting this proposition, we have to discuss it here first and pass it and then they have to discuss and afterwards we have to psss the Appropriation Bill.

† **Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.**—My point is only this. We are covered under article 205 so far as Supplementary Grants are concerned. 205 lays down the procedure to be followed in such cases. Articles 198 and 199 deal with the procedure of money bills. 198 prescribes the procedure to be followed. The very first sentence is " money bill should not be introduced in the Legislative Council ". Clause 2 says that after the Bill has been passed by the Legislative Assembly in a State having a Legislative Council, it shall be transmitted to the Council for itrecommendations. Therefore, it would suggest that the Legislativs Assembly has to pass it and transmit it to the Council for its recommenedations, if any.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Does the member call the Demands, a money Bill ? If he goes to the extent of saying Supplementary Demands are money Bills, what is the shape of the Bill, according to him ?

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—Sir, article 205 says what is the Supplementary Bill is. 205 is very clear. Any amount asked, whether as extra expenditure or unforeseen expenditure, it is a Supplementary Demand in addition to the original grant passed by the legislature.

Mr. SPEAKER.—A Bill and a Demand are distinct and different.

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—Whether it is a Bill or Demand, it is a matter of financial implication. Appropriation Bill comes under 204. 205. also refers to 204. Even though we cannot call this as Appropriation Bill and call it an Additional Grant, it is a Bill so far as the procedure is concerned. Whether it is a Bill or Grant, 202 should apply.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—Sir, the discussion and voting of these Demands lead to the passing of the Bill. So, we cannot differentiate between the Bill and the Demand. We cannot say that Appropriation is something different from the several Demands that the House is to vote.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Then, they must also be able to vote on the Demands, if it is part of the Appropriation Bill.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—Constitutionally they cannot vote the Demand as such.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Therefore, the two things are different. You are unnecessarily linking them up.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—In our opinion, it is not different and therefore, to have it initiated in the Upper House, violates Constitutional provision.

Sri B. D. JATTI (Minister for Finance).—Sir, no new point has been raised by the Hon. Members in this House. Demands are quite different from the Bill. Unless the Demands are discussed and voted and passed in this Assembly, we cannot think of having the Appropriation Bill. If the Appropriation Bill is to be passed, it will be passed here and sent to the Council. Then only we have the authority to draw the money. They cannot mix both the issues. A demand cannot be considered as a Bill. Bill is in a different form and of a different nature. If the Demands are discussed here and passed and it is discussed in Upper House, it makes no meaning.

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—Sir, in article 206, it deals with Vote on Accounts. It is not an Appropriation Bill. If there should be a Vote on Account it is to be in this House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sri K. S. Suryanarayana Rao is bringing up a new point without properly linking it.

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—Vote on Account is not a money Bill. But, can we say that there may be discussion in the Upper House in the first instance? No. This House has to pass it and then only they can do it.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Which provisions say it? After it is passed, what are they to discuss? These ideas are separate—Demands, Supplementary Demands, Excess Demands or even Vote on Account and Appropriation Bill. They are distinct.

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—I quite see the point, but, unfortunately, the procedure laid down, according to me, is the same. So, in dealing with all these money matters, this is the procedure we have to follow—198 to 207. We pass vote on account which is not a money Bill, vote on account is taken in this House and not in the Upper House; therefore, on that analogy, this is the procedure that is to be followed.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member brings in Vote on Account and then raises up an analogy. They are not dealing with the Vote on Account. There are specific provisions in the constitution. After the Demands are passed, then the Appropriation Bill stage arises. The Appropriation Bill is passed here; then, it is to be transmitted; this is the correct wording of the article. Therefore, so far as we are concerned there is nothing to say whether they should discuss there or not. But, we must read the entire thing and make sense out of it and not confuse ourselves by saying that after we have passed, they should discuss and the grievances that they have discussed and not voted because they have no right to vote. They have discussed and we are discussing now. We accept it or reject it. Suppose, we pass; then, the Appropriation Bill should be brought before the House. If we discuss and pass and then ask them to discuss, it will be travesty of common sense; it will be insulting. What is the point in asking the Council to discuss it after we have passed it here? It will not be fair to them; we must have enough affection for them.

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—We do not mean any disrespect to them. It is a matter of procedure and that is why I have raised it ?

DEMAND No. 2—LAND REVENUE

9. *Land Revenue.*

Sri B. D. JATTI (Minister, for Finance).—Sir, on behalf of the Hon'ble Minister for Revenue and on the recommendation of the Governor of Mysore, I beg to move :

> "That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 14,44,640 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the financial year for the period ending 31st day of March 1965 in respect of Land Revenue".

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved.

> "That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 14,44,640 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the financial year for the period ending 31st day of March 1965 in respect of Land Revenue".

This demand and all the other demands *viz.* Nos. 4,10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 20, 23, 24, 25, 39, 44, 45, 46, 48, 53, 53A and demand No. 54 will be deemed to have been moved and are open for debate. Sri Siddaiah Kashimath will speak first.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿದ್ದಯ್ಯ ಕಾಶೀಮಠ (ಶಿರಹಟ್ಟಿ).—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಅರ್ಥ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು 20 ಕೋಟಿ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಹೆಚ್ಚುವರಿ ಬೇಡಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನಾದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ನಂಬರ್ 10, 13, 15, 53 ಮತ್ತು 54ರಲ್ಲಿರುವ ವಿಚಾರಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಕೆಲವು ಸಲಹೆಗಳನ್ನು ನೀಡಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

10ನೆಯ ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮೈಸೂರು ಸರಕಾರದ ಏಜೆಂಟರ ಆಫೀಸಿನ ಬಗ್ಗೆ 12,000, ಸಿಬ್ಬಂದಿಗೆ 3,100 ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಹೀಗೆಲ್ಲಾ ಖರ್ಚು ತೋರಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಅವರು ನಮ್ಮ ಏಜೆಂಟರಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ಹೇಳಬಹುದು. ನಮ್ಮ ಸರಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಬರಬೇಕಾದ ಕೆಲವು ಪದಾರ್ಥಗಳ ಕೋಟಾ ದಿನ ದಿನಕ್ಕೆ ಕಡಿಮೆಯಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ಪರವಾಗಿರುವ ಸಿಬ್ಬಂದಿ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಹಾಗಿರುವಾಗ ಇಷ್ಟು ಸಿಬ್ಬಂದಿ ಏಕೆ ? ಅದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸಾಧುವಲ್ಲ. ಶ್ರೀ ಖನ್ನಾರವರಿಗೆ 275-530ರ ಸ್ಕೇಲಿತ್ತು. ಅವರು ನಾನ್ ಗೆಜೆಟೆಡ್ ಆಫೀಸರಾಗಿದ್ದರು. ಅಂಥವರನ್ನು ಗೆಜೆಟೆಡ್ ಹುದ್ದೆಗೇರಿಸಿ 350-900ರ ಸ್ಕೇಲನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾದ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆ ಇರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಪ್ರತಿವರ್ಷವೂ ಸಕ್ಕರೆ, ಸಿಮೆಂಟು, ಜಿಂಕ್‌ಷೀಟುಗಳ ಕೋಟಾ ಕಡಿಮೆಯಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಬದಲಾಗಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಸರಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳನ್ನೇ ಅಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಉಪಯೋಗವೂ ಆಗುತ್ತಿತ್ತು ಮತ್ತು ಖರ್ಚೂ ಸಹ ಕಡಮೆಯಾಗುತ್ತಿತ್ತು. ನಾನ್ ಗೆಜೆಟೆಡ್ ಆಫೀಸರನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದು ಕೊಂಡು ಗೆಜೆಟೆಡ್ ಆಫೀಸರನ್ನಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರೆ 3,100 ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಉಳಿಯುತ್ತಿತ್ತು. ಏಜೆಂಟರ ಆಫೀಸಿಗಾಗಿ 18,300 ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಖರ್ಚು ತೋರಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಅಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಸಿಬ್ಬಂದಿಯಿಂದ ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಕೆಲಸ ಎಷ್ಟುಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಆಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಖರ್ಚಿಗೆ ತಕ್ಕ ಕೆಲಸವಾಗಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ರೀತಿ ಇರುವಾಗ ಇಷ್ಟು ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡುವುದು ಅನಾವಶ್ಯಕ.

ಇನ್ನು 13ನೆಯ ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡಿನ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ ಸ್ಟೇಟ್ ಕ್ಲೈಂ ಇನ್‌ವೆಸ್ಟಿಗೇಷನ್ ಇಲಾಖೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಸ್ಪೆಷಲ್ ಯೂನಿಟ್ ಕ್ರಿಯೇಟ್ ಮಾಡಿ 27,707 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಖರ್ಚು ತೋರಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇಲ್ಲಿಯವರೆಗೆ ಅವರೇನಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ಟ್ರಕ್ ಹಿಡಿದಿರುವರೇ ? ಒಂದು ಅಂಗಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ 8 ಮೂಟೆ ಹಿಡಿದರು. ದೊಡ್ಡ ದಾಸ್ತಾನು ಇಟ್ಟಿರುವವರಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾರನ್ನೂ ಹಿಡಿದಿಲ್ಲ. ಹಾಗಿರುವಾಗ ಇದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ 27 ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸಮಂಜಸವಾಗಿ ಕಾಣುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ನಿಗಾ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಸೂಕ್ತ ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು.

15ನೆಯ ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಆಹಾರ ಧಾನ್ಯಗಳ ಸಲುವಾಗಿ 3 ಜನ ಜಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಡೈರೆಕ್ಟರುಗಳು, 6 ಜನ ಅಸಿಸ್ಟೆಂಟ್ ಡೈರೆಕ್ಟರುಗಳು, ಒಬ್ಬ ಹೆಡ್‌ಕ್ವಾರ್ಟರ್ಸ್ ಅಸಿಸ್ಟೆಂಟರು ಮುಂತಾದವರನ್ನು ನೇಮಿಸಿ ಸಿಬ್ಬಂದಿಗಾಗಿ 7 ಲಕ್ಷ ಚಿಲ್ಲರೆ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ಸಿಬ್ಬಂದಿ, ಇದರಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಅಸಿಸ್ಟೆಂಟ್ ಕಮಿಷನರುಗಳು ಮಾಡುವುದಾದರೂ ಏನು ? ಡೈರೆಕ್ಟರ ಆಫೀಸಿನಲ್ಲಿರುವ 3 ಜನ ಅಸಿಸ್ಟೆಂಟ್ ಕಮಿಷನರುಗಳಿಗೇನೂ ಕೆಲಸವಿಲ್ಲ. ಇಂಥ ದೊಡ್ಡ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಗೆಜೆಟೆಡ್ ಆಫೀಸರುಗಳನ್ನು ನೇಮಿಸಿ ಅವರಿಂದೇನೂ ಸರಿಯಾದ ಕೆಲಸ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳದಿದ್ದರೆ ವ್ಯರ್ಥಾ ಖರ್ಚು ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಹಿಂದಿದ್ದ ಆಫೀಸರುಗಳಿಂದಲೇ ಈ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಿಸಬಹುದು. ಹೀಗೆ ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಕವಾಗಿ ಬೇರೆ ಸಿಬ್ಬಂದಿ ನೇಮಿಸಬೇಕಾದ ಅಗತ್ಯವಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ 7 ಲಕ್ಷ ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಇನ್ನುಮೇಲಾದರೂ ನಿಗಾ ಇಟ್ಟು ಆವಶ್ಯಕವಾಗಿರುವ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತ್ರ ನೇಮಕಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿ ಖರ್ಚು ವ್ಯರ್ಥಾ ಆಗುವುದನ್ನು ತಪ್ಪಿಸಬೇಕು.

53ನೆಯ ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಶಿವಮೊಗ್ಗಾದಲ್ಲಿ ಬತ್ತ ಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಒಂದು ಕೋಟಿ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಅಡ್ವಾನ್ಸ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ವಿಚಾರ ಹೇಳಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಆರ್ಥ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೇಳುವುದಿಷ್ಟೆ : ಹಿಂದೆ ಬತ್ತದ ಖರೀದಿ ಮಾಡಿದಾಗ ಗೋಡೌನ್ ಖಾಲಿ ಇರುವ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಇತ್ತು; ಮುಂಬಯಿ ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕದಲ್ಲಿ ಬತ್ತವೆಲ್ಲಾ ಮಾಯವಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ಗೋಡೌನ್ ಖಾಲಿ ಇತ್ತು. ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯಿಂದ ಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದನ್ನು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ದಾಸ್ತಾನಿಡಲು ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಅಷ್ಟೇ ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಗೋಡೌನ್ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿದೆಯೆ ಎಂದು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಸೂಪರ್‌ವೈಜ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಸಾರ್ಥಕವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಈಗ ಒಂದು ಕೋಟಿ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಿಂತ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ದುರುಪಯೋಗವಾಗದಂತೆ ನೋಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟವರು ಸರಿಯಾದ ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು.

54ನೆಯ ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಹಣ ಅಡ್ವಾನ್ಸ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಮಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಸಾಲ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಆದರೆ ಕಷ್ಟಪಡುತ್ತಿರುವ ರೈತರಿಗೆ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಸಹಾಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಎಂ. ಎಸ್. ಕೆ. ಮಿಲ್ ಮುಂತಾದ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಹಣ ವಿಪರೀತವಾಗಿ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬದಲಾಗಿ ವ್ಯವಸಾಯಗಾರರಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಅನುಕೂಲ ವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆಹಾರದ ಅಭಾವ ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ತುಂಬಿರುವಾಗ ಅದನ್ನು ಹೋಗಲಾಡಿಸಲು ರೈತರ ಸಹಕಾರ ಅಗತ್ಯ. ಅವರಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಸಹಾಯ ಒದಗಿಸಬೇಕು. ಅದುದರಿಂದ ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಹಣ ಅದಷ್ಟು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ರೀತಿಯಿಂದ ಖರ್ಚಾಗುವಂತೆ ನೋಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತ ಎಂದು ಸೂಚಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಎಸ್. ಸೂರ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ರಾವ್.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ಸಪ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟರಿ ಗ್ರಾಂಟಿನ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ವಿಷಯ ಹೇಳದೆ ಒಂದೆರಡು ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಎರಡು ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡುಗಳಿವೆ. ಅದರ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಇಷ್ಟು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ : ಈ ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಗಳನ್ನು ಸ್ಥಾಪಿಸುವ ಮತ್ತು ಹೆಚ್ಚುಮಾಡುವ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಸರಕಾರ.....

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಡಿ. ಜತ್ತಿ.—ಯಾವ ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ಮೇಲೆ ತಾವು ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ ?

5-30 P.M.

ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನಾನು 24 ಮತ್ತು 44ನೇ ಡಿಮಾಂಡುಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತ ಒಂದು ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಗಳ ಬೆಳವಣಿಗೆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತ ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಗಳ ಪ್ರಗತಿಗಾಗಿ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಹಣವನ್ನು ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಶಕ್ತಿ ನಮಗೆ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ನಾವು ಒಂದು ಜಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಸ್ಟಾಕ್ ಕಂಪೆನಿಯಾಗಿ ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಫಾರೆನ್ ಕೊಲಾಬೊರೇಷನ್ ಪಡೆಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆಂದು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಒಂದು ಹೇಳಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಹೇಳಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ನನಗಾದರೂ ವ್ಯಸನವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ನಮಗೆ ಶಕ್ತಿ ಇಲ್ಲ, ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ರೆಸೋರ್ಸಸ್ ಇಲ್ಲ, ನಮಗೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ, ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಹಣಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಜಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಸ್ಟಾಕ್ ಕನಸರ್ನ್ ಆಗಿ ಬದಲಾಯಿಸಿ ಫಾರೆನ್ ಕೊಲಾಬೋರೇಷನ್ನಿಗೆ ಹೋಗುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ ಎನ್ನುವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಮೂಡುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಲ್ಲ. ನಮಗೆ ಫಾರೆನ್ ಕೊಲಾಬೊರೇಷನ್ ಬೇಕು. ಅದನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದು ಕೊಳ್ಳೋಣ. ಅದು ಯಾವ ಹಂತದಲ್ಲಿ ಬೇಕು, ಏತಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಆದರೆ ಕೇವಲ ಹಣದ ಅಭಾವದಿಂದ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಅಷ್ಟು ಗೌರವವನ್ನು ತರತಕ್ಕ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಾಗಲಾರದೆನೋ ಎಂದು ನನಗನ್ನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—I cannot say 'No' to a thing which I do not know. But here the Hon'ble Member is to offer his remarks on the supplementary demands only and not beyond that.

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—We find so many things here. But when we sometimes make statements outside, we feel that we have no money. But that is a contradiction when we see these things here.

Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA (Chief Minister).—Where is the money ?

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—We are providing Rs. 7.33 crores for expansion of industries like the New Government Electric Factory.

Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA.—It is a very small amount.

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—I agree that it is no doubt a small sum.

ನಮಗೆ ಹಣ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ, ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯಲು ನಾವು ಜಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಸ್ಟಾಕ್ ಕನ್ಸರ್ನ್ ಆಗಿ ಪರಿವರ್ತನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಅಷ್ಟು ಗೌರವಯುತವಾಗು ತ್ತದೆಯೋ ಇಲ್ಲವೋ ಎಂದು ನನ್ನ ಸಂದೇಹ. ಕನ್‌ವರ್ಷನ್ ಆಫ್ ಫ್ಯಾಕ್ಟರೀಸ್ ಎಂದು ಏನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ವಿವರಣೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಎರಡನೆಯದಾಗಿ ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಜಾಗವನ್ನು ಅಕ್ವೈರ್ ಮಾಡಿ ರಿಸರ್ವ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಅದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಯುಕ್ತವಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ನನ್ನ ಸಲಹೆ. ಕಾರಣವೇನೆಂದರೆ, ಇಂಥ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದರೆ ಲಕ್ಷಾಂತರ ಎಕರೆ ಭೂಮಿ ಯನ್ನು ಅಲ್ಲಲ್ಲಿ ಅಕ್ವೈರ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಗಳಿಗೋಸ್ಕರ ರಿಸರ್ವ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಆ ಭಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಸ್ವಾಧೀನಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದಿರುವ ಜಮೀನಿನ ಕ್ರಯವನ್ನು ಗೊತ್ತು ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಅದರ ಬೆಲೆ ಅದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಆಗಲಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲ. ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ಜಮೀನಿಗೆ ಇಷ್ಟು ದರಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಕೊಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಒಂದು ಆಜ್ಞೆಯನ್ನು ಹೊರಡಿಸಿದರೆ ಅದರ ಬೆಲೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆ ಜಮೀನುಗಳನ್ನು ಎಲ್ಲಿಯತನಕ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದೋ ಅಲ್ಲಿಯ ವರೆಗೂ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿ ಆ ನಂತರ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಗಳು ಬರುವಾಗ ಆ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಸ್ವಾಧೀನಕ್ಕೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು. ಅದನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಏನೂ ಪ್ರತಿಫಲವಿಲ್ಲದ್ದರಮೇಲೆ ಇಷ್ಟೊಂದು ಹಣವನ್ನು ಹಾಕುವುದರಿಂದ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಹಣವನ್ನು ವ್ಯಯ ಮಾಡಿದಂತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದರಿಂದ ಏನೂ ಉಪಯೋಗವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಗಾಗಿ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ರಿಸರ್ವ್ ಮಾಡುವುದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಆದರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಇಷ್ಟೇ ಧಾರಣೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಡಿಕ್ಲೇರ್ ಮಾಡುವುದರಿಂದ ಜಮೀನಿನ ಧಾರಣೆಯು ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಅರ್ಥ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಸಲಹೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ನಮ್ಮ ಮೈಸೂರು ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಇಷ್ಟು ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ, ಅಷ್ಟು ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಭಾಷಣಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಆದರೆ ಇವತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಯಾವ ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಯೂ ಆಗಲಲ್ಲವಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ವಿನಯದಿಂದ ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಖಾಸಗಿಯವರಾಗಲೀ ಸರ್ಕಾರವಾಗಲೀ ಒಂದು ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಯನ್ನೂ ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಏಕೆ ಪುರು ಮಾಡಲಲ್ಲ, ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಿಂದ ಮಾತಿನುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಅದು ಏಕೆ ಆಗಲಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಸರ್ಕಾರವನ್ನು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಉದಾಹರಣೆಗೆ ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ, ಆಲ್ಯೂಮಿನಿಯಂ ಕಾರ್ಖಾನೆ ನಮಗೆ ಬರಲಲ್ಲ, ಆಯಿಲ್ ರಿಫೈನ ಫ್ಯಾಕ್ಟರಿ ನಮಗೆ ಬರಲಾರದು, ಮದ್ರಾಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಬಹುದು ಎಂದು ನಾವು ಹೇಳಿದಾಗ ಅದು ನಿಮ್ಮ ಊಹೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಇವತ್ತು ಅದು ಮದ್ರಾಸಿಗೆ ಹೋಯಿತು. ಉಕ್ಕಿನ ಕಾರ್ಖಾನೆಯ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಜಿಜ್ಞಾಸೆ ಇದೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ರಾಜಕೀಯ ಬೇಡ, ಟೆಕ್ನಿಕಲ್ ಮೆನ್ ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡಲಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಆದರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಏನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆಂದರೆ, ಇವರು ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಹಣವಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವಾಗ ನಾವೇ ಉಕ್ಕಿನ ಕಾರ್ಖಾನೆಯನ್ನು ಪ್ರಾರಂಭ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಜನ ಅದನ್ನು ನಂಬುತ್ತಾರೆಯೇ ಎಂದು ನೋಡಬೇಕು.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It does not arise under Supplementary Demands.

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—Steel Plant comes in because in Bellary District we propose to acquire so many thousands of acres

for industrial purposes. It may be for location of the steel mill. Can we start a steel mill in Hospet area however much we may wish to have it because the Finance Minister is very pessimistic about finances ?

Sri B. D. JATTI.—I have never said that I am a pessimist. The Hon'ble Member is making a wrong statement. I have never said that I am a pessimist.

Mr. SPEAKER.—With regard to finances, the Finance Minister has no pessimism. He is always optimistic. According to the industrial policy of the Government of India, a steel plant will primarily be in the public sector for which monies can be found in more than hundred ways. Why bring it here ?

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—I honestly and genuinely wish that it should come to Mysore in Hospet or anywhere else.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—Is there anybody who wish that we should not get the steel plant in our State ?

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—What are your efforts ?

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—If a steel plant could be started without the assistance of the Government of India or foreign collaboration by our own resources and from our own funds, I say you use all this money asked for in the supplementary demands and start the steel mill and not spend on any of these items.

Mr. SPEAKER —Steel plant is not under supplementary demands and therefore it does not arise here. Does the member expect steel plant to be provided under supplementary demands ?

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—I believe every one in this House is very firm about it, but we are also led to believe that the high-ups in this country do not allow us to have it in Mysore State but to have it outside. This is the statement made by men in responsible positions.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The whole Debate is outside the demands.

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—I would like to ask what happened to the private sector industries for which licences have been issued by Government. None of them have come up.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Such industries do not come under the supplementary demands. No money has been asked for that purpose.

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—Demand No. 44 speaks of investment in other commercial concerns, which relates to private sector industries like REMCO. Government have promised certain facilities to big industries but I would ask the Finance Minister as to what happened to them. There was a licence issued for a rayon factory in Dandeli, a licence for National Rayons near Mysore, a paper factory near Hospet and so on.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Are we discussing provisions in the supplementary demand or non-provision of moneys for this and that industry ?

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—I quite see the point of Mr. Speaker. While appreciating everything done, I am asking the Finance Minister to look into some other incidental matters pending for so many years. I only say that Government must have gone further than what they intend to do with moneys under this supplementary demand. Likewise, a licence was issued for 11 spinning mills in the State and I am afraid that none of them have come up.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That means that the Hon'ble Member has no points in respect of the Demands before the House. He wants the Finance Minister to provide more moneys for things not specified in the supplementary demands.

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—Another point about agricultural sector. We propose to do so many things. I would only ask what progress has been achieved so far. We have officers and officers who are not qualified and who are not fit to do the jobs expected of them. Names cannot be mentioned here but I can give such instances. Such things should not happen when Government wants more and more money.

† Sri G. V. GOWDA.—Sir, the schemes included in the Third Five-Year plan would receive a set-back inasmuch as moneys provided for major and medium irrigation projects are not going to be spent fully In Demand 45 we are told that a token provision has been made for the creation of posts and that Government would reappropriate moneys earmarked and saved from irrigation projects for which provision has been made for the year 1964-65 in the budget. Therefore it is obvious that money provided for the Tungabhadra or Kabini projects are to be saved and that money utilised for creation of new posts in the department. This is regrettable and should not have happened.

Sir, I read in the morning's papers today that the Mysore Government has agreed to release 45 TMCFT of water from the Tungabhadra reservoir. I do not know how the Government has taken this decision and if it is wise in the interests of the State. We are having only 5 to 6 per cent irrigated area whereas Andhra has 26 per cent. The Tungabhadra reservoir would give us 8 lakh of acres under irrigation whereas now we have been able to utilise only 2½ lakh acres. In these circumstances to agree to give water to Andhra is against the interests of this State. It is fantastic and Government should not have agreed to it. Even if the Andhra Government had made such a proposal, this Government should have summarily rejected it. Such releases of water should not be made even for a temporary period because it would create rights. If the ryots in Andhra get water from Tungabhadra for 5 years, could the Government stop it after that period. Would not some rights be created there by ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Use by consent cannot create prescriptive rights.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—There is no consent between the Government and the ryots. They have irrigated about 2 lakh acres and they are yet to construct. They are going ahead with the Nagarjunasagar Dam.

Sri VEERENDRA PATIL.—If you yield, I will explain. The Hon'ble Member is under the wrong impression that at the cost of Mysore, water is released for growing second crop in the Krishna delta. We have discussed this matter sufficiently with the representatives of the Andhra Government. They want water to raise second crop in the I area which comes to 3. 8 lakh acres in the Krishna delta for only 45 days. It is true in order to give water that is required for raising the second crop up to a certain the level the water in the reservoir goes down and we have to shut down the generating station. The question arose that after the generating station is shut down, there would be loss of power on account of release of water. They have agreed to make good the loss of power and they have agreed to give us 21 Mwts. of power free of cost. Whatever the area that is going to be benefited, they are going to charge at the rate of Rs. 10 per acre. After deducting the collection charges, whatever amount is realised, they are going to credit it to our account. There is no waste and there is no harm and we are not sacrificing the interest of Mysore. We are releasing the water after our requirements are fully met. Only surplus water in the reservoir is given for a period of 45 days.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—Water is surplus because we are not able to utilise on account of the existence of localisation scheme. Supposing that scheme was not in vogue, there would have been no surplus. There is a proposal to construct upper Tunga.

Sri VEERENDRA PATIL.—This is purely a temporary arrangement only for this year. It is not going to be a precedent and we are not going to allow this water every year. They are not getting any right; it is purely a temporary arrangement only for this year.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—I know that our Government cannot make permanent commitment. But, the principle is bad. Whatever reasonableness may be there, it would give scope to construe that we are not alert to make use of that water.

No reason is given for not utilising the water though already 11 years are over. I have reason to believe that the amount earmarked has not been spent and much savings are effected.

Demand 22—This relates to schemes in the Third Plan, *i.e.*, sample survey, poultry extension centre. These are contemplated in the Third Plan. Even amounts have been provided for these schemes in various areas. Steps have not been taken to create posts and appoint officers for the purpose of implementing these schemes. Neither they include in the original estimates nor they do it in the next financial statement. Now in the fag end they come and say that they have to create posts for development of poultry, etc. These are planned schemes and the Government knows the amount earmarked for that purpose. They cannot say that it is an unforeseen expenditure. There are several items like that.

Regarding Demand 23.—This is in respect of an official who filed a suit in the Civil Judge Court. The Government appealed to the District

(SRI G. V. GOWDA)

Court and the suit was dismissed and then the man dies. After the death of the person, Government passes an order reinstating him.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—As a lawyer the Hon'ble Member knows that even if a person dies, when the Court decrees that the person should be reinstated, according to law whatever is due to him should be calculated from the date of reinstatement and paid to the legal heirs.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If claims could be defeated by the death of the creditor, how many debtors will be happy ?

Sri H. R. KESHAVA MURTHY.—Is there any objection of his coming in the shape of ghost ?

Sri B. D. JATTI.—If the Hon'ble Member can represent the ghost, we have no objection.

(Laughter)

† **Sri G. V. GOWDA.**—So far as loans and advances from Hyderabad Government are concerned, I should say that the Government was not alert in assessing which was the loan that was due to the Government and whether it was recoverable or not and whether the loan said to have been advanced was genuine or not. It was simply said that so much was due from the Hyderabad Karnatak and these people accepted without knowing whether the persons from whom the loans were due were alive or not or whether they were secured loans. Nothing was verified and now the Government has been compelled to write off nearly to the extent of 8 lakhs. By this, I should say that steps have not been taken to safeguard the interest of the State and therefore this 8 lakhs is required to recoupe the written off loans.

As regards the sum of Rs. 8,76,360 to be adjusted in order to recoupe the written off loans.

Item No. 3, under this Demands relates to the expenditure of Rs. 8,76,360, for payment to the Indian Airlines Corporation being the net loss sustained in running the Bangalore-Mangalore-Bangalore air service for 17 or 18 months. Mysore State is poor and most of our people know the conditions obtaining here. Now to make good the loss of Rs. 8,76,360 incurred by the Airlines Corporation is really very hard. How is the Government obliged to enter into contract with the Airlines?

6-00 P.M.

Subsidy to Indian Air Lines. I am glad if Sri Sanjeevanath Aikala is to be benefited by this.

Mr. SPEAKER.—You say that Sri Sanjeevanath Aikala is to be benefited and nobody else.

†**Sri G. V. GOWDA.**—I do not mean that Sri Sanjeevanath Aikala is a middle class man and has derived the benefit. It is only the big people

like businessmen who will be much benefited. They are going frequently in the air. They are benefited much, and we have to make good the loss.

Demand No. 54 (ix): Temporary advances to M.S.K. Mills, Ltd., Gulbarga, in connection with its Rehabilitation.

We have not recommended the extension of loans or for providing for any share capital. In fact it is said this additional loan of 12 lakhs for discharging statutory liabilities is sanctioned. In fact it is our firm opinion that such statutory liabilities exist over all shareholders but also on other persons who have got interest in the Company. We have to make that gentleman to purchage the entire shares and see that all the money is invested by him. The Government is having 50 per cent while 40 per cent is owned by other people. I do not agree with the Government assisting this factory for additional loan of 12 lakhs and participating in its working. I would suggest that the Government must see in the near future to purchase all the shares at least to the extent of 90 per cent so far as M.S.K. Mills are concerned.

Item No. 4: So far as the loans to Silk Marketing Society, Bangalore, I do not agree with the idea of the Government advancing loans to these Silk Co-operative Marketing Societies. The society must have made itself credit-worthy and should be in a position to operate independently. If necessary Government can stand guarantee. Government advancing 4 to 5 lakhs is not justified because, the primary object of making every silk producer to become a member of the Silk Society will be a failure.

Demand No. 2: Remuneration to Shanbhogues and Patels.

Government want to pay remuneration to these people out of the collection of land revenue and surcharge. So far, the Government do not give any information as to their commitment in this regard. In fact it is the bounden duty of the Patels to collect land revenue. Therefore, they must also collect the surcharge. I do not know why this extra allowance or remuneration should be given to them. It is also not stated in the explanatory note as to which part of the State this remuneration is to be paid. Is this payment a statutory obligation and under what circumstances the Government have agreed to commit themselves in this matter we do not know.

Demand No. 13: Criminal Investigation Department.

Several Officers have been appointed by the Food Department. I do not know what work has been taken up by this staff, specially meant for criminal investigation. Are they really doing any work? Several Officers in the Food Department are supposed to assist the Deputy Commissioner in purchasing foodgrains. So far as I could see no Officer additionally appointed has done anything in respect of purchasing Paddy and Jola in this harvest season. But nothing has been done. We have seen in papers that in several places like Bombay, Andhra and Madras they are doing good work. But what was done in our State? No

(SRI G. V. GOWDA)

person has unearthed unaccounted money. Government has passed several control orders saying that a person should not keep more than a certain quantity. But no big offenders have been booked for contravening these control orders. Supposing, a man is taking some rice or something for domestic use, he will be caught. Only such petty offenders will be booked by these people.

So far as the Agricultural Department is concerned they have purchased 25 Bull Dozers. What have they done so far with the Bull Dozers and Tractors ? A tractor is to work 500 hours in one year. Not even 150 hours they have worked in our State. Therefore, the ryots have not been benefited by these tractors. Further they want 20 Tractors and Bull Dozers. I want Agricultural Department to be improved. It is not giving any corresponding benefits. One of the Departments that reserves criticisms is Agriculture Department.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The House will now rise to meet tomorrow at 8-30 A.M.

The House adjourned at Ten Minutes past Six of the Clock to meet again at Thirty Minutes past Eight of the Clock on Saturday, the 30th January 1965.

MD 4358—GPB—500—9-4-65